

Arizona Department of Financial Institutions

Felecia A. Rotellini Superintendent of Financial Institutions Janet Napolitano Governor

April 25, 2007

Anna Solis 3205 W. Paradise Dr. Phoenix, AZ 85029

Reference: Docket No. 07F-BD054-BNK---Anna Solis

Dear Ms. Solis:

I have completed my review of the record in the matter of Anna Solis. Enclosed is my Final Decision and Order.

Please be advised that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.09, this Order shall be final unless written motion for rehearing is submitted no later than thirty (30) days after service of this decision. The motion for rehearing or review must specify the particular grounds upon which it is based. In the alternative, the parties may seek judicial review of this decision pursuant to A.R.S. §41-1092.08(H).

Please contact Assistant Attorney General Erin O. Gallagher at (602) 542-8935 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Felecia Rotellini Superintendent

EB:jb

cc: Erin O. Gallagher, Assistant Attorney General

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

In the Matter of the Removal and the Prohibition of:

ANNA SOLIS

3205 W. Paradise Dr. Phoenix, AZ 85029

Respondent.

No. 07F-BD054-BNK

SUPERINTENDENT'S FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

The Superintendent of Financial Institutions (the "Superintendent") having reviewed the record in this matter, including the transcript of the March 29, 2007 administrative hearing, and the, Administrative Law Judge Decision attached and incorporated herein by this reference, adopts the Administrative Law Judge's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommended Decision.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent is removed from further participation in any manner in the affairs of any financial institution or enterprise in the State of Arizona.

NOTICE

The parties are advised that, pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.09, this Order shall be final unless Respondent submits a written motion for rehearing no later than thirty (30) days after service of this decision. The motion for rehearing or review must specify the particular grounds upon which it is based as set forth in A.A.C. R20-4-1219. A copy shall be served upon all other parties to the hearing, including the Attorney General, if the Attorney General is not the party filing the claim of error. In the alternative, the parties may seek judicial review of this decision pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.08(H).

DATED this 25th day of April, 2007.

Felecia Rotellini

Superintendent of Financial Institutions

1	ORIGINAL filed this day of
2	April , 2007, in the office of:
3	Felecia Rotellini
4	Superintendent of Financial Institutions Arizona Department of Financial Institutions
5	ATTN: June Beckwith 2910 North 44th Street, Suite 310
6	Phoenix, Arizona 85018
7	COPY of the foregoing mailed/hand delivered
8	This same date to:
9	Dorinda M. Lang, Administrative Law Judge Office of Administrative Hearings
10	1400 West Washington, Suite 101 Phoenix, AZ 85007
11	Erin O. Gallagher, Assistant Attorney General
12	Office of the Attorney General 1275 West Washington
13	Phoenix, AZ 85007
14	Robert D. Charlton, Assistant Superintendent Arizona Department of Financial Institutions
15	2910 N. 44th Street, Suite 310 Phoenix, AZ 85018
16	AND COPY MAILED SAME DATE by
17	Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to:
18	Anna Solis 3205 W. Paradise Dr.
19	Phoenix, AZ 85029
20	
21	BY: Opena Blakesin
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

IN THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

In The Matter Of:

ANNA SOLIS

No. 07F-BD054-BNK

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE DECISION

HEARING: March 29, 2007

APPEARANCES: Erin O. Gallagher; Assistant Attorney General representing the

Department of Financial Institutions; Anna Solis, Respondent

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Dorinda M. Lang

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Department of Financial Institutions issued a Notice of Hearing and Intent to Remove and Prohibit from Further Participation in Any Manner in the Conduct of the Affairs of a Financial Institution or Enterprise and Complaint ("Notice of Hearing") to Anna Solis on February 5, 2007. It alleged that Anna Solis committed several violations of Arizona statutes governing escrow agents. It concluded that those alleged violations established grounds under Arizona law to remove and prohibit Ms. Solis from participating in any manner in the conduct of the affairs of any financial institution of enterprise.
- 2. The Notice of Hearing informed Ms. Solis that she had 20 days from the issuance of the Notice of Hearing to file a written answer. It further informed her that failure to file an answer may be deemed an admission of the allegations. If Ms. Solis did not have sufficient information to form an answer to any of the allegations, the Notice of Hearing informed her that she may say so in the answer and this would be deemed a denial.
- 3. Ms. Solis did not file a written answer at any time. On March 14, 2007, 16 days after the deadline for filing an answer, she submitted a motion to the Office of Administrative Hearings stating, in pertinent part, "I am kindly requesting a continuous (sic) of this

Office of Administrative Hearings 1400 West Washington, Suite 101 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (602) 542-9826

1 2

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

26

27

28

29

30

case, and an extension of the date to file my written answer. Need to view files I do not have or keep copies of every filed (sic) closed so enable (sic) to say anything about them cause I do not remember everything." The motion was denied on March 15, 2007 because it did not constitute good cause for a continuance. Ms. Solis did not ask the Department of Financial Institutions for an extension of the time to file an answer.

∵18

- 4. On March 29, 2007, the matter came on for hearing at the Office of Administrative Hearings, an independent agency authorized to conduct hearings in matters arising out of State legislation. Ms. Solis appeared at hearing. She stated at that time that she did not yet have an attorney and would not be able to respond to the allegations until she had more time to go through the files. She did not propose any legally excusable reason for failing to file a timely answer to the Notice of Hearing.
- 5. The Assistant Attorney General representing the Department of Financial Institutions argued that she did not file a timely answer to the Notice of Hearing or contact the Department to request an extension of time to answer. It is also noted that her motion to the Office of Administrative Hearings was not made within the 20 days allowed to file an answer either. The Department asked that the failure to file an answer be deemed an admission to all of the allegations in the Notice of Hearing. When given an opportunity to make any argument against deeming her failure to answer an admission, Ms. Solis offered no additional comments or arguments.
- 6. The Administrative Law Judge ruled in favor of the Department and found that all of the allegations were deemed admitted. Ms. Solis offered no legal or factual argument or information to place in the record; therefore, no testimony was taken in the matter and the record was closed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. This matter is within the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 6-138, 6-161, and 41-1092.02.
- 2. A.R.S. § 6-834(A) provides that escrow money must be deposited in the appropriate accounts as soon as is reasonably practicable. A.R.S. § 6-841.01(A) provides that an escrow agent is the trustee of money collected or received and held in escrow. A.R.S. § 6-161(A)(1) provides that the Superintendent may remove or suspend from office of prohibit from participation in affairs of financial institutions or enterprises those employees and others who demonstrate personal dishonesty or unfitness in a business

transaction. A.R.S. § 6-161(A)(6) provides that the Superintendent has the same power if an employee such as Respondent violates any other provision of that title.

- 3. Pursuant to A.A.C. R20-4-1209, Ms. Solis had 20 days to file a written answer to the allegations contained in the Notice of Hearing. A.R.S. § 6-161(B) provides that if Ms. Solis failed to answer the charges without excusable neglect, the Superintendent may issue the appropriate order. Ms. Solis failed to file an answer at any time prior to the hearing. She did not offer any reason for her failure to do so that would constitute excusable neglect either in her request for a continuance or at the time of the hearing. Since she did not file an answer at any time prior to the hearing, and since the Department has requested that the allegations be deemed admitted, it is recommended that the allegations be deemed admitted.
- 4. In addition to the time she had to file an answer, Ms. Solis was given the opportunity at hearing to make a legal argument against finding that the admitted allegations did not constitute violations of the applicable escrow statutes. She had no argument or excuse to offer at that time.
- 5. The allegations set forth several instances that would constitute violations of the escrow statutes A.R.S. §§ 6-834(A) and 6-841.01(A). Pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 6-161(A)(1), 6-161(A)(6), the Superintendent has the authority to remove and prohibit Ms. Solis from participating in any manner in the conduct of affairs of any financial institution or enterprise.

RECOMMENDED DECISION

Based upon the foregoing considerations, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge hereby recommends that the Superintendent of the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions remove Anna Solis from any and all positions she may hold in any financial institution or enterprise and prohibit her from participating in the affairs in any financial institution or enterprise in the future.

Done this day, April 6, 2007

- 17

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

Dorinda M. Lang

Administrative Law Judge

Original transmitted by mail this ______, 2007, to:

Arizona Department of Financial Institutions Felecia Rotellini

ATTN: June Beckwith

2910 North 44th Street, Suite 310

Phoenix, AZ 85018

By Chris Fashled